



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

times as wars have been indulged in for the past fifty years. Thus would be furnished a tremendous amount of data available to all peoples disposed to enter upon armed conflict. It is entirely safe to say that with this data gathered together new proof would be afforded that aggressive war cannot be carried on, and even what Grotius called "a just war" cannot be indulged in, without bringing terrible punishment upon the nations concerned. After all, we shall add but little to the wisdom of the poet who wrote:

When thou hearest the fool rejoicing, and he saith, "It is over and past,
And the wrong was better than right, and hate turns into love at the last,
And we strove for nothing at all, and the Gods are fallen asleep;
For so great is the world agrowing that the evil good shall reap;"
Then loosen thy sword in the scabbard and settle the helm on thine head,
For men betrayed are mighty, and great are the wrongfully dead.

And thus it is that war breeds war, and we become involved in a vicious circle, recognized as legitimate by the international law writers, but in which justice as between man and man, between nation and nation, plays no part.

AN APPEAL TO CHRISTIANS FOR STARVING RUSSIA

By SAMUEL McCREA CAVERT

IN AN area bigger than our entire Atlantic seaboard—no food! In the region of the Volga today hunger on a vaster scale than known within the memory of man!

At least fifteen million peasants in Russia starving to death! Plain, cold facts, corroborated by the head of the American Relief Administration. "The worst famine in the history of the world," Mr. Hoover calls it.

Rubbish carts going around to collect the dead bodies of children every day. Peasants trying to subsist on a bread composed of withered grass or powdered bark. Incredible, but true—confirmed by the representatives of the Quakers in that land of the shadow of death.

And twelve dollars will save a life till harvest time. How many *lives of Russian children* are we spending in needless luxuries? Surely, we need a deeper conscience on the sin of selfish luxury when others are dying for lack of what we recklessly waste. For our own sake we dare not be so callous as to ignore their cry. It would mean a famine of the soul worse than the famine of the body that the Russians face.

"And then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world; for I was hungered and ye gave me meat."

The standard of judgment is the way we have treated another. What if we should have to hear: "Inasmuch as ye did it not to the least of these, my brethren, ye did it not to me."

Dare we say before that Judgment-seat that the Rus-

sians are only getting what they deserve? Are we to punish little children for the mistakes of their fathers? Are the peasants to blame for the overwhelming drought? And are we to forget that Russia gave far more lives in the World War for freedom than any other nation, and gave them in those critical days before we had ourselves come in—gave till utterly exhausted and a suffering people was plunged into revolution? In a very real sense Russia gave those lives in our stead. What are we now to do for her? In the fine words of President Harding, "We must put aside considerations of international politics and fundamental differences in government. The big thing is the call of the suffering and the dying." To that call the Christian people of America, above all others, ought to make reply.

THE EXCITEMENT OF IRISH PEACE

The treaty between Great Britain and Ireland, reported in the last issue of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, was duly ratified on December 16 in the British Parliament by overwhelming majorities—156 to 47 in the House of Lords, and 401 to 58 in the House of Commons—but the expected prompt victory in the Dail Eireann did not materialize. It was not until January 7, after a protracted and bitter debate which threw the action of the body into uncertainty, that ratification was won, and the majority was only 64 to 57.

In both parliaments there were "die-hards." Lord Carson being notable in the British, with a passionate protest, but it was only in the Dail Eireann that, under the leadership of Eamonn de Valera, they made a real and formidable showing. De Valera began fighting almost as soon as the pact was signed in London by the commissioners. At first it was thought that he could do no more than create a flurry, so intense was the Irish desire that the incredibly terrible warfare, halted in the summer, should not be resumed, and so firm were many of the most ardent of the Irish leaders in the belief that the treaty gave the Irish people genuine freedom. But it soon appeared that he commanded a following of importance in the Dail, if not among the masses of the Irish people.

One reason given for his unexpected strength was that many of the members were men who had served in the Irish army and had become embittered in the most extreme degree. It also was a fact that he commanded vigorous support from members who were not of Irish birth—from champions of Irish freedom born in England and elsewhere, who had made the Irish cause their own. It is a somewhat singular fact that de Valera himself was not born on Irish soil.

Described by his friend, H. W. Nevins, who has been in Washington representing the *Manchester Guardian* at the Conference on the Limitation of Armament, as being as rigid as an equilateral triangle, de Valera was in action as early as December 12 against the treaty giving a dominion status to Ireland, instead of the absolute divorcement from Britain that he sought. In a statement issued on that day, he denied emphatically that the honor of Ireland demanded that the Dail ratify the treaty to which the Irish commissioners had fixed their signatures. His statement was:

I have been asked whether the honor of Ireland is not involved in the ratification of the agreement arrived at. The honor of Ireland is not involved. The plenipotentiaries were sent on the distinct understanding that any agreement they

made was subject to ratification by the Dail Eireann and by the country, and could be rejected by the Dail if it would not commend itself to the Dail, or by the country if it did not commend itself to the country.

The Parliament of Great Britain and the people of Great Britain will, on their side, similarly consider the agreement solely on its merits. If the British Parliament desires, it can reject it; so can the British people. Ratification is, then, no mere empty formality.

The United States refused to ratify a treaty signed even by its President. The honor of the nation is not involved, unless and until the treaty is ratified.

The fight raged furiously thereafter, even though very influential figures in the Catholic clergy of Ireland gave their support to Arthur Griffith and Michael Collins, two of the present-day heroes of Ireland, who were among the commissioners who signed and who led the fight in the Dail. Dublin took on the appearance of a city in which a great political convention was under way. The factions organized thoroughly, and the campaign for votes was made in the most thorough way—by direct appeals and arguments and by appeals to the constituencies behind the members. Mary McSwiney, sister of the Lord Mayor of Cork, Terence McSwiney, who starved himself to death in protest against arrest by the British, joined de Valera's forces and made a profound impression by a lengthy and vehement speech.

By December 21 efforts were being made to bring the debate in the Dail, much of which had been in secret, to a close. De Valera argued that it be finished, and Griffith pled for 15-minute speeches. A sentimental wish to give the verdict to the Irish people before Christmas entered. But all of these pleas put together could not halt the flood of words and the clash of opinion, and the fight continued after the turn of the year. On January 4 de Valera shifted from a negative to a positive position by offering the Irish a substitute plan. This has been described as differing mainly from the treaty agreed upon in London in that it made the Irish people the source of authority instead of the King of Great Britain, who is the source under the treaty, according to the views of de Valera's supporters.

A statement of the principal provisions in de Valera's substitute follows:

Status of Ireland.—That the legislative, executive, and judicial authority of Ireland shall be derived solely from the people of Ireland.

Terms of Association.—That for the purpose of common concern Ireland shall be associated with the status of the British Commonwealth, namely, the Kingdom of Great Britain, the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa.

That when acting as an associate, the rights, status, and privileges of Ireland shall in no respect be less than those enjoyed by any other component States of the British Commonwealth; that the matters of common concern shall include defense, peace, war, political treaties, and all matters now treated as of common concern among the States of the British Commonwealth, and that in these matters there shall be between Ireland and the States of the British Commonwealth such concerted action founded on consultation as the several governments may determine.

That in virtue of this association of Ireland with the States of the British Commonwealth, the citizens of Ireland in any of these States shall not be subject to any disabilities which a citizen of one of the component States of the British Commonwealth would not be subject to, and reciprocally for the citizens of these States in Ireland.

That, for the purposes of the association, Ireland shall recognize his Britannic Majesty as head of the association.

That, so far as her resources permit, Ireland shall provide for her own defense by sea, land, and air, shall repel by force any attempt by a foreign power to violate the integrity of her soil or territorial waters, or to use them for any purpose hostile to Great Britain and the other associated States.

In other respects, according to press dispatches, the de Valera plan followed the general lines of the London treaty.

At the time the substitute was made public de Valera issued the following manifesto to the Irish people:

FELLOW-CITIZENS, You are in danger. Influences more deadly to the nation faced by an enemy, than a plague in the ranks of its army, are at work among you. The instinct in you for peace and repose, as natural after the period of strain you have passed through as the craving for food in the famished, is being played upon. If you give way, you are undone. All you have gained will be lost and all the sacrifices you have made will be in vain.

The cry of peace, peace, will not bring you peace, not now any more than a year ago, and those who shout it will lead you not in peace, but to another betrayal.

Have you already forgotten that "bird-in-hand" home rule on the statute book? The embers of bonfires are still black on the slopes of Errigal.

It is not those who would hold you in your ranks calm and firm, while you take your bearings and see whither you are going or are being led, who would create chaos, but those who hysterically shout it and try to make you all as panic-stricken as themselves. It is easy to induce rout; it is hard to check it, once it has begun. If you had a national press it would warn you; but your press is a press that when the enemy was actively making war upon you obeyed its dictates and allowed itself to be used in the work of sapping your morale from day to day; a press that during the recent negotiations was quoted in London against the delegates of the nation when they tried to represent your true aspiration; a press that last July, when the British proposals were made, would have broken your discipline—a discipline that had brought you safe through every peril and led to rout even then—had it dared.

Today, availing of the opportunity and under the shelter of honored names, this press, instead of bidding you beware, urges you to a stampede as dangerous as it would be disgraceful, a stampede that would expose you to the attack of an enemy no less than to the pity or contempt of the world, whose admiration your heroism has just won.

Oh, do not allow yourselves to be rushed into registering inconsiderately a decision which you yourselves will live to deplore and which generations to come will curse you for.

Do not pretend to set the seal of your approval on a settlement that you know cannot be a settlement. Do not for the first time in her history allow Ireland to be put in the wrong as regards England. Do not impair the moral foundation of Ireland's fight for her freedom. Do not enter upon a compact which in your hearts you know can never be kept in sincerity and in trust, no matter how worthy.

They are neither good friends to Ireland, nor to England, nor to humanity, who advise you to take that course. Be bold enough to say "No" to those that ask you to misrepresent yourselves. If there were not a gun nor an ounce of lead in Ireland, you should say it.

You are being asked to give your consent and approval to a treaty establishing British authority in Ireland, not as you were asked formerly to work an act of the British Parliament thrust upon you. You are being asked to bind yourselves with your own hands. Do not forget it—you are asked to give your parole. Refuse, as in honor you must, if you do not mean to keep it.

A combination of circumstances such as occurs but once in the relations of warring peoples has created an opportunity of genuine reconciliation between Ireland and England. Save it from being lost through the short-sighted expediency of politicians. It is not politicians who must come to an agreement, but peoples. Reconciling the politicians does not reconcile the peoples. These cannot be reconciled so long as the old grounds for fear and distrust between them remain.

You know that they will remain under the terms of the treaty that is now proposed to you. Do not plunge the peoples of these islands into another 120 years of hatred and bitterness such as that which has passed since a former so-called treaty of union was made.

To the utmost limit to which they could go, our delegates have gone to arrive at an agreement such as this nation could freely accept—gone voluntarily and willingly, in a genuine desire for peace and in full appreciation of the governing conditions. By the threat of war they were dragged beyond that limit, and the deed and circumstances will ever be remembered by Irishmen as the crowning act of infamy of England's rulers against Ireland. Peace of good will was aside, and a peace that cannot be peace shamelessly imposed.

It is not thus that enduring compacts and lasting peace are made. You, the people, can retrieve the position even at this eleventh hour. The policy you stand by, that will always be practical politics; your standing by it will make it so. It is with you that peace must ultimately be made.

Do not yourselves be misled by innuendo, and safeguard your declaration of independence instead of subverting it. Is it a shadow that would remove the authority of the British King, the British Cabinet, and the British Parliament unequivocally from Ireland, that would remove from Ireland the British Governor-General, with his ear to the Downing Street telephone, that would rid you of British occupation, that would leave Irishmen and Irish women their identity as Irish citizens and not make British subjects of them. That would leave honest men and women their self-respect when engaging in their country's service?

These are represented to you as shadows, and in the same breath you are told that Mr. Lloyd-George will wage an immediate and terrible war upon you rather than acknowledge your right to them. You do not need very close analysis to show that it cannot be both ways.

Stand fast, fellow-citizens, by what you know to be right. Do not allow yourselves to be tempted from the straight and honorable path. If you quail at the consequences, what will they not ask you to surrender next to this ignoble fear?

The next day a group that became known as the Peace Committee was actively at work seeking a basis of compromise and agreement between the factions. They apparently made little progress. On the following day, January 6, de Valera announced that he would resign as President of the Irish Republic, but his resignation apparently was coupled with reservations. The impression gathered was that he would resign if the treaty were ratified, but would continue in office and seek another treaty should the one negotiated be rejected. His course caused some irritation and uncertainty, but seemingly did not weaken his hold upon his followers. Indeed, his despondency evoked sympathy even from those fighting him, who generally united in warm recognition of his devotion to the Irish cause.

The day after de Valera spoke of resigning was the day the Dail ratified the treaty. Beaten, de Valera was not crushed. He reiterated his views, and maintained that the Irish Republic was created by the people and could be dissolved only by them. On January 10, following three days of uneasiness, the members of the Dail who had voted for ratification voted to elect Arthur Griffith to the Presidency of the body. The minority walked out of the chamber and did not vote.

At this time the indications are that troublous times are ahead in the south of Ireland, owing to the factional division. Many months will pass, observers report, before the new government will function normally. Meantime there remains the problem of adjusting relations with Ulster. But the consensus of opinion seems to be that the foundation for peace in Ireland has been laid securely.

EUROPE'S HESITANT STEPS

The statesmen of Europe have essayed at last the attempt at co-operation in economic rehabilitation, but it is not clear at this time whether this initial effort will be futile or whether it will survive its vicissitudes and presently bear fruit of value. The attitude of France, under the new Poincare ministry, will have great weight. And while Raymond Poincare's views as an intense nationalist are well known, it remains to be seen how he will translate them into action as he brings his great ability again to the responsibilities of the office of Premier of France.

Movements have been discernible for some weeks, which seemed to be aimed toward co-operation in Europe. About the time that President Harding, doubtless with private information about the status of matters in Europe, was explaining that while the United States desired to help Europe to her feet Europe must first try to help herself, important conferences were following one after another in London and other capitals of Europe. Hugo Stinnes, the German industrial baron, spent several days in London. In the latter part of November Dr. Walter Rathenau and other spokesmen for Germany in financial and industrial matters were in London. In December M. Briand went to London to talk with Mr. Lloyd-George.

Late in December all of this came to a head in an arrangement for a meeting of the Supreme Council in Cannes. On January 6, after a prolonged session of the Council, which was attended by Ambassador Harvey, announcement was made that it had been agreed to hold an all-Europe economic and financial conference in Genoa in the first two weeks of March. The lines of demarcation in the World War and in the subsequent relations of Europe were to be put aside in that Conference. Germany was to have a seat. And so was Russia, a pariah among the nations since the ascendancy of Bolshevism. The plan was to try to see Europe whole in dealing with its economic needs.

In the Associated Press dispatch from Cannes the following appeared:

Russia's participation in the Genoa Conference is conditional upon acceptance of a number of conditions, namely, that she cease Bolshevik propaganda abroad; that she undertake not to attack her neighbors, and that she recognize all the honorable obligations entered into by preceding Russian governments.

Premier Lloyd-George, of Great Britain, took the most prominent part in the deliberations, speaking for an hour. In his opinion a place for decisive action had been reached if the economic structure of Europe was to be saved. Describing the present meetings of the Supreme Council as the most important since the armistice, he declared that the public opinion of the world demanded that the Allies take wider responsibilities to revive Europe.

The Prime Minister sounded a warning that the Allies themselves must solve the problem of rehabilitating Europe economically, and he appealed to them to forget their prejudices and co-operate with this end in view.

Given the floor immediately after the French Premier, M. Briand, had welcomed the delegations in the grand salon of the Cannes Yacht Club, Mr. Lloyd-George launched into sharply pointed references to the French claims growing out of the war. He said the British were equally entitled to put forth claims, since their taxes as a result of the war were twice as heavy as those of any other country.

The remark of the British Prime Minister that most impressed the delegates was his reference to the prejudice that might exist against entering into relations with the Soviet Government because it had blood upon its hands.